



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The ancient law of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth is still in a large measure the law of human life as interpreted by the state. A man steals a loaf of bread to satisfy his hunger, and the state steals his liberty to satisfy its vengeance. A man kills another man in the heat of passion, or under great temptation, and the state kills him in cold blood, and without any temptation at all. And it is commonly believed that the doctrine, "Resist not evil," if applied to social life, would throw society back into anarchy. And yet criminology teaches us that severity toward criminals simply increases crime. In the good old times when robbers were broken on the wheel, and thieves were burned at the stake, robbers thronged every forest and beset every highway, while thieves and cut-throats lurked in every lane and alley of the city. As severity toward crime has lessened, the number of criminals and crimes has decreased. If we wish to put an end to crime we must in some way put an end to criminals. But you do not put an end to criminals by putting them in prison or by killing them. If you put a criminal in prison, you make him more of a criminal than ever. Prisons are schools of crime, from which men graduate after a longer or shorter period of education to prey upon society. Nor do you put an end to a criminal by killing him. A dead criminal is still a criminal. When the state solemnly executes a man it gives eternal significance to his crime. It can never be changed, but must remain forever a blot on human history. The vengeance of the state falls on innocent and guilty alike. The father and the mother, the wife and the children, must bear the shame of the crime forever. The only way to put an end to a criminal is to make him an honest man. You must in some way reach his soul, and stir within that soul the desire to do good. And, if you would have a man do good you must be good to him. You must reach his soul as Dinah Morris reached the poor soul of Hetty Sorel, the child murderer, — reached it not by accusation and severity, but by laying her cheek against the cheek of the hardened sinner until at last the love of Dinah thawed the heart of Hetty. So that heart wept tears of penitence; and Hetty was no longer a criminal, but a sorrowful, heart-broken woman. Victor Hugo was not a mere romancer, he was a profound psychologist, when he told the story of the good bishop and Jean Valjean, the convict. Resist not evil, is the maxim of the good bishop. You know the story. The soul of Jean Valjean was transformed. He became so great that the injustice of society could not crush him. The victim of that injustice, he triumphed over it by the greatness of his soul.

If society were to practice the doctrine of Jesus, of St. Francis of Assisi, and of Victor Hugo, we should soon have no need for our jails and our gallows. If we were always ready to forgive the sinner, we should have no need for further punishment — but forgiveness would bring him to penitence, and penitence to reformation.

To practice the precept of Jesus is not easy, because it requires the love of Jesus for men, and the patience of Jesus with men. Jesus' love for men was so great that it consumed at once any feeling of resentment against them. He pitied and prayed for his murderers in the moment of his own agony and death. Jesus' patience with men was so unlimited that he was willing to wait for ages if only so he could win the heart of man to his

way of thinking and feeling. Coziba, called Bar-Cochab, would overthrow the Roman power in a day; Jesus worked three hundred years to accomplish the same result. Coziba would conquer Rome by force of arms; Jesus by force of love. Coziba would destroy; Jesus would assimilate. Coziba's work was done when Coziba died; Jesus' real work did not begin until the day after his death. Coziba and his tribe are men of the past; Jesus is the man of the future. Let those of us who still believe in Jesus take heart. Evolution is on our side. Slowly, but surely, the world is coming round to Jesus' way of thinking. Formerly men gloried in warfare; now they apologize for it. In old time men went out to kill and to spoil their enemies; now they go with battleship and army to civilize them. If we kill the Filipino or the Boer, we do it only for their good. And we are more or less ashamed of ourselves, because we can find no better way to elevate them than the way of violence and treachery. We are ashamed of our slums, of our jails and our gibbets; and with shame will come sorrow, and with sorrow a better mind; and by and by we shall agree with Jesus that the only way to conquer our enemy is to make him our friend; the only way to overcome evil is to overcome evil with good. When that day comes, as it surely will, then we shall hear again the angels singing, "Peace on earth; good will toward men."

And, if we choose, that day can come to us to-night. To-night we can be Jesus men; men who will suffer evil, but never do it.

Peace to Come at Last — A Peace League of the Nations.

From the Rectorial Address of Andrew Carnegie, LL. D., delivered to the students of St. Andrews University, October 17, 1905.

Nothing can be clearer than that the leaders of Christianity immediately succeeding Christ, from whom authentic expressions of doctrines have come down to us, were well assured that their Master had forbidden to the Christian the killing of men in war or enlisting in the legions. One of the chief differences which separated Roman non-Christians and Christians was the refusal of the latter to enlist in the legions and be thus bound to kill their fellows in war as directed. We may well ponder over the change, and wonder that Christian priests accompany the armies of our day, and even dare to approach the Unknown, beseeching his protection and favor for soldiers in their heinous work. When the warring hosts are Christian nations, worshipping the one God, which, alas, is not seldom, as in the last gigantic orgy of human slaughter in Europe, we have the spectacle of the rival priests praying in the name of the Prince of Peace to the God of Battles for favor. Similar prayers were offered in the churches, where in some instances battle-flags, the emblems of carnage, were displayed. Future ages are to pronounce all this blasphemous. There are those of today who deplore it deeply. Even the pagan, before Christ, direct from human butchery, refrained from appealing to his gods without first cleansing himself of the accruing pollution.

It is a truism that the doctrines of all founders of religions have undergone modifications in practice, but it is strange indeed that the doctrine of Christ regarding war

and warriors, as held by his immediate followers, should have been so completely discarded and reversed in the later centuries, and is so still.

Bentham's words cannot be overlooked: "Nothing can be worse than the general feeling on the subject of war. The Church, the State, the ruling few, the subject many, all seem in this case to have combined to patronize vice and crime in their widest sphere of evil. Dress a man in particular garments, call him by a particular name, and he shall have authority, on divers occasions, to commit every species of offense—to pillage, to murder, to destroy human felicity; and for so doing he shall be rewarded. The period will surely arrive when better instructed generations will require all the evidence of history to credit that, in times deeming themselves enlightened, human beings should have been honored with public approval in the very proportion of the misery they caused."

Bacon's words come to mind: "I am of opinion that, except you bray Christianity in a mortar and mould it into new paste, there is no possibility of a holy war."

Apparently in no field of its work in our times does the Christian Church throughout the whole world—with outstanding individual exceptions of course—so conspicuously fail as in its attitude to war, judged by the standard maintained by the early Christian Fathers nearest in time to Christ. Its silence, when outspoken speech might avert war, its silence during war's sway, its failure even during calm days of peace to proclaim the true Christian doctrine regarding the killing of men made in God's image, and the prostitution of its holy offices to unholy warlike ends, give point to the recent arraignment of Prime Minister Balfour, who declared that the Church to-day busies itself with questions which do not weigh even as dust in the balance compared with the vital problems it is called upon to deal with.

*** * * * *

Much has man accomplished in his upward march from savagery. Much that was evil and disgraceful has been banished from life, but the indelible mark of war still remains to stain the earth and discredit our claim to civilization. After all our progress, human slaughter is still with us; but I ask your attention for a few minutes to many bright rays, piercing the dark cloud, which encourage us. Consider for a moment what war was in days past. It knew no laws, had no restrictions. Poison and assassination of opposing rulers and generals arranged by private bargain and deceptive agreements, were legitimate weapons. Prisoners were massacred or enslaved. No quarter was given. Enemies were tortured and mutilated. Women, children and non-combatants were not spared. Wells were poisoned. Private property was not respected. Pillage was the rule. Privateering and private war were allowed. Neutral rights at sea were almost unknown.

Permit me briefly to trace the history of the reforms in war which have been achieved, from which we draw encouragement to labor for its abolition, strong in the faith that the days of man-slaying are numbered.

The first action against the savage custom of war is found in the rules of the Amphictyonic Council of the Greeks, some three hundred years before Christ. Hellenes were "to quarrel as those who intend some day to be reconciled." They were to "use friendly correction, and

not to devastate Hellas or burn houses, or think that the whole population of a city, men, women and children, were equally their enemies and therefore to be destroyed."

We owe chiefly to Grotius the modern movement to subject hitherto lawless war on land and sea to the humane restraints of law. His first book, "Mare Librum," appeared in 1609. It soon attracted such attention that Britain had to employ her greatest legal authority, Lord Selden, to make reply. Up to this time Spain, Portugal and Britain had maintained that the surrounding seas were closed to all countries except those upon their shores,—a doctrine not formally abandoned by Britain until 1803.

Grotius's second and epoch-making work, "The Rights of War and Peace," appeared in 1625, and immediately arrested the attention of Gustavus Adolphus, the greatest warrior of his time. A copy was found in his tent when he died on the field of Lutzen. He stood constantly for mercy, even in those barbarous days. Three years after its appearance Cardinal Richelieu, to the amazement of Europe, spared the Huguenot garrison and protected the city of Rochelle, when he was expected to follow the usual practice of massacring the defenders and giving the town and inhabitants over to massacre and pillage. It was then holy work to slay heretics, sparing not one. He was denounced for this merciful act by his own party and hailed as "Cardinal of Satan" and "Pope of the Atheists." The treaty of Westphalia in 1648, three years after the death of Grotius, closed the Thirty Years' War in Germany, the Eighty Years' War in the Netherlands, and a long era of savagery in many parts of the globe. It shows clearly the influence of Grotius's advanced ideas, being founded upon his doctrine of the essential independence and equality of all Sovereign States and the laws of justice and mercy. In the progress of man from war, lawless and savage, to war, restricted and obedient to international law, no name is entitled to rank with his. He is the father of modern international law, so far as it deals with the rights of peace and war. He has had several eminent successors, especially Puffendorf, Bynkershoek and Vattel. These four are called by Phillimore "The Umpires of International Disputes." They are followed closely by a second quartette, the British judge, Stowell, and the American judges, Marshall, Story and Field.

International law is unique in one respect. It has no material force behind it. It is a proof of the supreme force of gentleness—the irresistible pressure and final triumph of what is just and merciful. To the few who have contributed conspicuously to its growth in the past, and to those laboring therein to-day, civilization owes an unpayable debt. Private individuals have created it, and yet the nations have been glad to accept. British judges have repeatedly declared that "international law is in full force in Britain." It is so in America and other countries. We have in this self-created, self-developing and self-forcing agency one of the two most powerful and beneficent instruments for the peace and progress of the world.

The most important recent reforms affected in the laws of war are those of the Treaty of Paris (1856), the Treaty of Washington (1871), which settled the Alabama Claims, and the Brussels Declaration of 1874.

The Treaty of Paris makes an era as having enshrined

certain principles. First, it abolished privateering. Henceforth, war on the sea is confined to national warships, organized and manned by officers and men in the service of the State. Commerce is no longer subject to attack by private adventurers seeking spoil. Second, it ruled that a blockade to be recognized must be effective. Third, it established the doctrine that the enemy's goods in a neutral ship are free, except contraband. These were great steps forward.

America declined to accept the first (in which, however, she has now concurred) unless private property was totally exempt on sea as on land, for which she has long contended, and which the powers, except Britain, have generally favored. So strongly has the current set recently in its favor that hopes are entertained that the forthcoming Conference at The Hague may reach this desirable result. It is the final important advance in this direction that remains to be made, and means that peaceful commerce has been rescued from the demon War. Should it be made, the trenchers of St. Andrews' students may well whirl in the air with cheers.

The Treaty of Washington is probably to rank in history as Mr. Gladstone's greatest service, because it settled by arbitration the Alabama Claims, a question fraught with danger, and which, if left open, would probably have driven apart and kept hostile to each other for a long period the two branches of the English-speaking race. A statesman less powerful with the great masses of his countrymen could not have carried the healing measure, for much had to be conceded by Britain, for which it deserves infinite credit. Three propositions were insisted upon by America as a basis for arbitration, and although all were reasonable and should have been part of international law, still they were not. Their fairness being recognized, Mr. Gladstone boldly and magnanimously agreed that the arbiters should be guided by them. These defined very clearly the duties of neutrals respecting the fitting out of ships of war in their ports, or the use of their ports as a naval base. This they must now use "due diligence" to prevent.

Morley says, in his "Life of Gladstone": "The Treaty of Washington and the Geneva arbitration stand out as the most noble victory in the nineteenth century of the noble art of preventive diplomacy, and the most signal exhibition in their history of self-command in two or three chief democratic powers of the Western World."

The Brussels Convention met in 1874.

Even as late as the earlier half of the last century the giving up of towns and their inhabitants to the fury of the troops which stormed them was permitted by the usages of war. Defending his conduct in Spain, Wellington says: "I believe it has always been understood that the defenders of a fortress stormed have no right to quarter." After the storming of San Sebastian, as to plunder he says: "It has fallen to my lot to take many towns by storm, and I am concerned to add that I never saw nor heard of one so taken by any troops that it was not plundered."

Shakespeare's description of the stormed city can never be forgotten:

" The gates of mercy shall be all shut up,
And the flushed soldier rough and hard
In liberty of bloody hand shall range
With conscience wide as hell."

This inhuman practice was formally abolished by the Brussels Declaration — that "a town taken by storm shall not be given up to the victorious troops to plunder." To-day to put a garrison to the sword would be a breach of the law of quarter, as well as a violation of the Brussels Declaration. We may rest assured the civilized world has seen the last of that atrocity.

We look back from the pinnacle of our high civilization with surprise and horror to find that even in Wellington's time, scarcely one hundred years ago, such savagery was the rule, but so shall our descendants after a like interval look back from a still higher pinnacle upon our slaying of man in war as equally atrocious, equally unnecessary, and equally indefensible.

Let me summarize what has been gained so far in mitigating the atrocities of war in our march onward to the reign of peace. Non-combatants are now spared, women and children are no longer massacred, quarter is given, and prisoners are well cared for. Towns are not given over to pillage, private property on land is exempt, or, if taken, is paid or received for. Poisoned wells, assassination of rulers and commanders by private bargain and deceptive agreements, are infamies of the past. On the sea, privateering has been abolished, neutral rights greatly extended and property protected, and the right of search narrowly restricted. So much is to be credited to the pacific power of international law. There is great cause for congratulation. If man has not been striking at the heart of the monster war, he has at least been busily engaged drawing some of his poisonous fangs.

Thus even throughout the savage reign of man-slaying we see the blessed law of evolution unceasingly at work performing its divine mission, making that which is better than what has been, and ever leading us on towards perfection. We have only touched the fringe of the crime so far, however, the essence of which is the slaughter of human beings, the failure to hold human life sacred, as the early Christians did.

One deplorable exception exists to the march of improvement. A new stain has recently crept into the rules of war as foul as any that war has been forced by public sentiment to discard. It is the growth of recent years. Gentilis, Grotius, and all the great publicists before Bynkershoek, dominated by the spirit of Roman law, by chivalry and long established practice, insist upon the necessity of a formal declaration of war, "that he be not taken unawares under friendly guise." Not until the beginning of the last century did the opposite view begin to find favor. To-day it is held that a formal declaration is not indispensable and that war may begin without it. Here is the only step backward to be met with in the steady progress of reforming the rules of war. It is no longer held to be contrary to these for a power to surprise and destroy while yet in friendly conference with its adversary endeavoring to effect a peaceful settlement. It belongs to the infernal armory of assassins hired to kill or poison opposing generals, of forged dispatches, poisoned wells, agreements made to be broken, and all the diabolic weapons which, for very shame, men have been forced to abandon as too infamous even for the trade of man-slaying. It proclaims that any party to a dispute can first in his right hand carry gentle peace, sitting in friendly conference, ostensibly engaged in finding a peaceful solution of differences,

while with the left he grasps, concealed, the assassin's dagger. The parallel between duel and war runs very close through history. The challenger to a duel gave the other party notice. In 1187 the German diet at Nuremberg enacted, "We decree and enact by this edict that he who intends to damage another or to injure him shall give him notice three days before." It is to be hoped that the coming conference will stamp this treachery as contrary to the rules of war, and thus return to the ancient and more chivalrous idea of attack only after notice.

We come now to the consideration of the other commanding force in the campaign against war — peaceful arbitration.

The originator of the world-wide arbitration idea was Emeric Crucé, born in Paris about 1590. Of his small book of two hundred and twenty-six pages upon the subject only one copy exists. Gerloius had propounded the idea in the twelfth century, but it failed to attract attention. Balch says, "Crucé presented what was probably the first real proposal of substituting international arbitration for war as the court of last resort for nations." It has a quaint preface. "This book would gladly make the tour of the inhabited world so as to be seen by all the kings, and it would not fear any disgrace, having truth for its escort and the merit of its subject, which must serve as letters of recommendation and credit."

Henry IV., in 1603, produced his scheme for consolidating Europe in order to abolish war, but as its fundamental idea was armed force and involved the overthrow of the Hapsburgs, it cannot be considered as in line with the system of peaceful arbitration.

St. Pierre, the Duc de Lorraine, William Penn, the Quaker founders of Pennsylvania, Bentham, Kant, Mill and others have endeavored to substitute the reign of law for war by producing schemes much alike in character, so that we have many proofs of the irrepressible longing of man for release from the scourge.

I beg now to direct your attention to the most fruitful of all conferences that have ever taken place. Other conferences have been held, but always at the end of war, and their first duty was to restore peace between the belligerents. The Hague Conference was the first ever called to discuss the means of establishing peace without reference to any particular war. Twenty-six nations were represented, including all the leading powers.

The Conference was called by the present emperor of Russia, August 24, 1898, and it is destined to be forever memorable from having realized Crucé's ideal, and given to the world its first permanent court for the settlement of international disputes. The last century is in future ages to remain famous as having given birth to this High Court of Humanity. The Conference opened upon the birthday of the Emperor, May 18, 1899. The day may yet become one of the world's holidays in the coming day of Peace, as that upon which humanity took one of its longest and highest steps in its history onward and upward. As Ambassador White says, "The Conference marks the first stage in the abolition of the scourge of war." Such an achievement was scarcely expected, even by the most sanguine. Its accomplishment surprised most of the members of the Conference themselves, but

so deeply and generally had they been appalled by the ravages of war and its enormous cost, by its inevitable progeny of future wars, and above all by its failure to ensure lasting peace, that the idea of a world court captivated the assembly, which has been pronounced the most distinguished that ever met. A less sweeping proposal would probably not have touched their imagination and aroused their enthusiasm. The prompt acceptance of the International Court by public sentiment in all countries was no less surprising. Every one of the powers represented promptly ratified the Treaty, the United States Senate voting unanimously — a rare event. We may justly accept this far-reaching and rapid success as evidence of a deep, general and earnest desire in all lands to depose war and enthroned peace through the judicial settlement of disputes by courts.

At last there is no excuse for war. A tribunal is now at hand to judge wisely and deliver righteous judgment between nations. It has made an auspicious start. A number of disputes have already been settled by it. First, it settled a difference between the United States and Mexico. Then President Roosevelt, when asked to act as arbiter, nobly led Britain, Germany, France, Italy, America and Venezuela to it for settlement of their differences, which has just been concluded.

Britain had recently a narrow escape from war with Russia, arising from the unfortunate incident upon the Dogger Bank, when fishing boats were struck by shots from her warships. There was intense excitement. The Hague Treaty provides that when such difficulties arise international commissions of inquiry be formed. This was the course pursued by the two governments, parties to the treaty, which happily preserved peace.

It was under another provision of the Hague Conference that the President of the United States addressed his recent note to Japan and Russia suggesting a conference looking to peace, and offering his services to bring it about. His success was thus made possible by the Hague Treaty. The world is fast awakening to its far-reaching consequences and to the fact that the greatest advance man has ever made by one act is the creation of a World Court to settle international disputes.

As I write word comes that to-morrow the august tribunal is to begin hearing France and Britain upon their differences regarding Muscat. There sits the divinest conclave that ever graced the earth, judged by its mission, which is the fulfilment of the prophecy, "When men shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning hooks, nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

Thus the world court goes marching on, to the dethronement of savage war and the enthronement of peaceful arbitration.

The Hague Tribunal has nothing compulsory about it; all members are left in perfect freedom as to whether they submit questions to it or not. This has sometimes been regarded as its weakness, but it is, from another point of view, its strongest feature. Like international law, it depends upon its merits to win its way, and, as we have seen, it is succeeding, but so anxious are many to hasten the abolition of war that suggestions are made towards gaining the consent of the powers to agree to submit to it certain classes of questions. In this it may

be well to make haste slowly and refrain from exerting pressure. This will all come in good time. Peace wins her way not by force; her appeal is to the reason and the conscience of man. In all treaties hitherto the great powers have retained power to withhold submission of questions affecting "their honor or vital interests." This was only natural at first, and time is required gradually to widen the range of subjects to be submitted. The tendency to do this is evident, and it only needs patience to reach the desired end. The greatest step forward in this direction is that Denmark and The Netherlands and Chile and Argentina have just concluded treaties agreeing to submit to arbitration all disputes, making no exception whatever. To crown this noble work, the latter two have erected a statue to the Prince of Peace on the highest peak of the Andes, which marks the long-disputed boundary between them.

Another splendid advance in this direction has been made in the agreement to arbitrate all questions between Sweden and Norway. Questions affecting "independence, integrity, or vital interests," are excepted, but should any difference arise as to what to do, that question is to be submitted. In other words, either nation can claim that a question does so, and, if the Hague Tribunal agrees, it is not arbitrated. But if the Tribunal decides the difference does not concern the "independence, integrity, or vital interest of either country," then it is submitted to arbitration. This is certainly a step forward, and you will please note that intangible thing—"honor"—is omitted.

These nations are to be cordially congratulated on taking the initial step in this splendid advance. We grudge not the honor and glory that has fallen to them therefrom, though in our hearts we may feel that this might more appropriately have been the work of the race that abolished slavery, both branches participating, and also abolished the duel. What our race should now do is to follow the example set and conclude such a treaty, operative within the wide boundaries of English speakers, Empire and Republic. Less than this were derogatory to our past as pioneers of progress. We cannot long permit these small nations to march in advance. We should at least get abreast of them.

We have noted that honor or vital interests have hitherto been excepted from submission by arbitration treaties. We exclaim, "Oh, liberty, what crimes are committed in thy name!" but these are trifling compared with those committed in the name of "honor," the most dishonored word in our language. Never did man or nation ever dishonor another man or nation. This is impossible. All honor's wounds are self-inflicted. All stains upon honor come from within, never from without. Innocence seeks no revenge, there is nothing to be revenged, guilt can never be. Man or nation whose honor needs vindication beyond a statement of the truth, which puts calumny to shame, is to be pitied. Innocence rests with that, truth has a quiet breast, for the guiltless find that

" So dear to heaven is saintly innocence
A thousand liveried angels lackey her
To keep her from all sense of sin and shame."

Innocent honor, assailed, discards bloody revenge and seeks the halls of Justice and Arbitration. It has been

held in the past that, a man's honor assailed, vindication lay only through the sword. To-day it is sometimes still held that a nation's honor, assailed, can in like manner be vindicated only through war, but it is not open to a member of our race to hold this doctrine, for within its wide boundaries no dispute between men can be lawfully adjusted outside the courts of law. Instead of vindicating his honor, the English-speaking man who violated the law by seeking redress by personal violence would dishonor himself. Under our law, no wrong against man can be committed that justifies the crime of private vengeance after its commission.

The man of our race who holds that his country would be dishonored by agreeing to unrestricted arbitration forgets that according to this standard he is personally dishonored by doing that very thing. Individually he has become civilized; nationally he remains barbaric, refusing peaceful settlement and insisting upon national revenge—all for injured honor. Which of us would not rejoice to have Britain and America share with Denmark and Holland, Chile and Argentina, the "dishonor" they have recently incurred, and esteem it a proud possession?

Nations are only aggregates of the individual. The parallel between war and the duel is complete, and as society within our race already relies upon Courts of Justice to protect its members from all wrongs, so shall the nations finally rely upon International Courts.

Objection has been made that unreasonable, dishonoring or baseless claims might be made under arbitration. That any member of the family of nations would present a claim wholly without basis, or that the Court would not decide against it if made, is a danger purely hypothetical. The agreement between nations when made will undoubtedly be framed in accordance with the ideas of Grotius, and the independence and equality of all members and their existing territories recognized. These could not be assailed.

Three incidents have occurred since the Court was organized which have caused much pain to the friends of peace throughout the world.

America refused the offer of the Filipinos to adjust their quarrel by arbitration. Britain refused the offer of the Transvaal Republic to arbitrate, although three of the Court proposed by the Republic were to be British judges, and the other two judges of Holland—the most remarkable offer ever made, highly creditable to the maker and a great tribute to British judges. Neither Russia or Japan suggested submission to The Hague. Since the Hague Court is the result of the Russian Emperor's initiative, this caused equal surprise and pain. The explanation has been suggested that peaceful conferences were being held when Japan attacked at Port Arthur without notice, rendering arbitration impossible.

We must recognize these discouraging incidents, but we have the consolation left us of believing that, had either of the three nations seen, at the beginning, the consequences of ignoring arbitration as clearly as they did later, they would have accepted arbitration and had reason to congratulate themselves upon the award of the court, whatever it was. They will learn by experience. Notwithstanding these regrettable failures to refer disputes to the Hague Court as peaceful umpire, we have abundant reason for satisfaction in the number of

instances in which the court's award has already brought peace without the sacrifice of one human life—the victories which bring no tears.

Signs of action in favor of universal peace abound. Among these may be mentioned that the Interparliamentary Union assembled at St. Louis last year requested the governments of the world to send representatives to an international conference to consider: *First*, the questions for the consideration of which the conference at The Hague expressed a wish that a future conference be called. *Second*, the negotiation of arbitration treaties between the nations represented. *Third*, the advisability of establishing an international congress to be convened periodically for the discussion of international questions.

President Roosevelt invited the nations to call the conference, but has recently deferred to the Emperor of Russia as the proper party to call the nations together again.

Should the proposed periodic congress be established, we shall have the germ of the Council of Nations, which is coming to keep the peace of the world, judging between nations, as the Supreme Court of the United States judges to-day between states embracing an area larger than Europe. It will be no novelty, but merely an extension of an agency already proved upon a smaller scale. As we dwell upon the rapid strides toward peace which man is making, the thought arises that there may be those now present who will live to see this world council established, through which is sure to come in the course of time the banishment of man-slaying among civilized nations.

I hope my hearers will follow closely the proceedings of the Hague Conference, for upon its ever-extending sway largely depends the coming of the reign of peace. Its next meeting will be important, perhaps epoch-making. Its creation and speedy success prepare us for surprisingly rapid progress. Even the smallest further step taken in any peaceful direction would soon lead to successive steps thereafter. The tide has set in at last, and is flowing as never before for the principle of arbitration as against war.

So much for the Temple of Peace at The Hague. Permit me a few words upon arbitration in general.

The statesmen who first foresaw and proved the benefits of modern arbitration were Washington, Franklin, Hamilton, Jay and Grenville.

As early as 1780 Franklin writes: "We make daily great improvements in natural, there is one I wish to see in moral, philosophy—the discovery of a plan that would induce and oblige nations to settle their disputes without first cutting each other's throats." His wish was realized in the Jay Treaty of 1794, from which modern arbitration dates. It was noteworthy that this treaty was the child of our race, and that the most important questions which arbitration has settled so far have been those between its two branches.

It may surprise you to learn that from the date of the Jay Treaty, one hundred and eleven years ago, no less than five hundred and seventy-one international disputes have been settled by arbitration. Not in any case has the award been questioned or disregarded, except, I believe, in one case, where the arbiters misunderstood their powers. If in every ten of these differences so quietly adjusted without a wound there lurked one war,

it follows that peaceful settlement has prevented fifty-seven wars—one every two years. More than this, had the fifty-seven wars, assumed as prevented by arbitration, developed, they would have sown the seeds of many future wars, for there is no such prolific mother of wars as war itself. Hate breeds hate, quarrel breeds quarrels, war breeds war—a hateful progeny. It is the poorest of all remedies. It poisons as it cures. No truer line was ever penned than this of Milton's, "For what can war but endless war still breed?"

No less than twenty-three international treaties of arbitration have been made within the past two years. The United States made ten with the principal powers, which only failed to be formally executed because the Senate, which shares with our Executive the treaty-making power to the extent that its approval is necessary, thought it advisable to change one word only,— "treaty" for "agreement,"—which proved unsatisfactory to the Executive. The vote of the Senate was almost unanimous, showing an overwhelming sentiment for arbitration. The internal difference will no doubt be adjusted.

You will judge from these facts how rapidly arbitration is spreading. Once tried, there is no backward step. It produces peace and leaves no bitterness. The parties to it become better friends than before; war makes them enemies.

Much has been written upon the fearful cost of war in our day, the ever-increasing blood-tax of nations, which threatens soon to approach the point of exhaustion in several European lands. To-day France leads with an expenditure of £3 14s and a debt of £31 3s 8d per head. Britain follows with an annual expenditure of £3 8s 8d and a debt of £18 10s 5d per head. Germany's expenditure is in great contrast—only £1 15s 4d, not much more than one-third; her debt, £2 12s 2d, not one-sixth that of Britain. Russia's expenditure is £1 14s 6d, about the same as the German; her debt, £5 9s 9d per head.

The military and naval expenditure of Britain is fully half of her total expenditure; that of the other great powers, though less, is rapidly increasing.

All the great national debts, with trifling exceptions,—Britain's eight hundred millions, France's twelve hundred millions sterling,—are the legacies of war.

This drain, with the economic loss of life added, is forcing itself upon the nations concerned as never before. It threatens soon to become dangerous unless the rapid increase of recent years be stopped, but it is to be feared that not till after financial catastrophe occurs will nations devote themselves seriously to apply the cure.

The futility of war as a means of producing peace between nations has often been dwelt upon. It is really the most futile of all remedies, because it embitters contestants and sows the seeds of future struggles. Generations are sometimes required to eradicate the hostility engendered by one conflict. War sows dragons' teeth, and seldom gives to either party what it fought for. When it does the spoil generally proves dead sea fruit. The recent terrible war just concluded is another case in point. Neither contestant obtained what he fought for, the reputed victor being most of all disappointed at last with the terms of peace. Had Japan, a very poor country, known that the result would be a debt of two hundred millions sterling loading her down, or had Russia known the result, differences would have been

peacefully arbitrated. Such considerations find no place, however, in the fiery furnace of popular clamor—as little do those of cost or loss of life. Only if the moral wrong, the sin in itself, of man-slaying is brought home to the conscience of the masses may we hope speedily to banish war. There will, we fear, always be demagogues in our day to inflame their brutal passions and urge men to fight, as a point of honor and patriotism, scouting arbitration as a cowardly refuge. All thoughts of cost or loss of human life vanish when the brute in man, thus aroused, gains sway.

It is the crime of destroying human life by war and the duty to offer or accept peaceful arbitration as a substitute that needs to be established, and which, as we think, those of the church, the universities, and of the professions are called upon to strongly emphasize.

If the principal European nations were not free through conscription from the problem which now disturbs the military authorities of Britain, the lack of sufficient numbers willing to enter the man-slaying profession, we should soon hear the demand formulated for a league of peace among the nations. The subject of war can never be studied without recalling this simplest of all modes for its abolition. Five nations coöperated in quelling the recent Chinese disorders and rescuing the representatives in Pekin. It is perfectly clear that these five nations could banish war. Suppose even three of them formed a league of peace, inviting all other nations to join, and agreed that since war in any part of the civilized world affects all nations, and often seriously, that no nation shall go to war, but shall refer international disputes to the Hague Conference or other arbitral body for peaceful settlement, the league agreeing to declare non-intercourse with any nation refusing compliance. Imagine a nation cut off to-day from the world. The league also might reserve to itself the right, where non-interference is likely to fail or has failed to prevent war, to use the necessary force to maintain the peace, each member of the league agreeing to provide the needed forces, or money in lieu thereof, in proportion to her population or wealth. Being experimental and upon trial, it might be deemed advisable, if necessary, at first to agree that any member could withdraw after giving five years' notice, and that the league should dissolve five years after a majority vote of all the members. Further provisions, and perhaps some adaptations, would be found requisite, but the main idea is here.

The Emperor of Russia called the Hague Conference, which gave us an International Tribunal. Were King Edward or the Emperor of Germany or the President of France, acting for their governments, to invite the nations to send representatives to consider the wisdom of forming such a league, the invitation would no doubt be responded to and probably prove successful. The number that would gladly join such a league would be great, for the smaller nations would welcome the opportunity.

The relations between Great Britain, France and the United States to-day are so close, their aims so similar, their territories and fields of operation so clearly defined and so different that these powers might properly unite in inviting other nations to consider the question of such a league as has been sketched. It is a subject well worthy the attention of their rulers, for of all the modes of hastening the end of war this appears the easiest and

the best. We have no reason to doubt that arbitration in its present optional form will continue its rapid progress, and that it in itself contains the elements required finally to lead us to peace, for it conquers wherever it is tried, but it is none the less gratifying to know that there is in reserve a drastic mode of enforcement, if needed, which would promptly banish war.

Notwithstanding all the cheering signs of the growth of arbitration, we should delude ourselves if we assumed that war is immediately to cease, for it is scarcely to be hoped that the future has not to witness more than one great holocaust of men to be offered up before the reign of peace blesses the earth. The scoria from the smoldering mass of the fiery past, the seeds that great wars have sown, may be expected to burst out at intervals more and more remote until the poison of the past is exhausted. That there is to be perfect, unbroken peace in our progress to this end we are not so unduly sanguine as to imagine. We are prepared for more than one outbreak of madness and folly in the future as in the past, but that peace is to come at last, and that sooner, much sooner, than the majority of my hearers can probably credit, I, for one, entertain not one particle of doubt.

* * * * *

Students of St. Andrews, my effort has been to give you a correct idea of the movement now stirring the world for the abolition of war, and what it has already accomplished. It never was so widespread or so vigorous, nor at any stage of the campaign have its triumphs been so numerous and important as those of the last few years, beginning with the Hague Conference, which in itself marks an epoch. The foundation stone of the structure to come was then laid. The absolute surrender by four nations of all future differences to arbitration, and Norway and Sweden's agreement, mark another stage. Thus the civilized world at last moves steadily to the reign of peace through arbitration.

The question has no doubt arisen in your minds, what is your duty and how can you best coöperate in this holy work and hasten the end of war. I advise you to adopt Washington's words as your own, "My first wish is to see this plague of mankind (war) banished from the earth." Leagues of peace might be formed over the world with these words as their motto and basis of action. How are we to realize this pious wish of Washington's? may be asked. Here is the answer. Whenever an international dispute arises, no matter what party is in power, demand at once that your government offer to refer it to arbitration, and if necessary break with your party. Peace is above party. Should the adversary have forestalled your government in offering arbitration, which for the sake of our race I trust will never occur, then insist upon its acceptance and listen to nothing until it is accepted. Drop all other public questions, concentrate your efforts upon the one question which carries in its bosom the issue of peace or of war. Lay aside your politics until this war issue is settled. This is the time to be effective. And what should the ministers of the churches be doing? Very different from what they have done in the past. They should cease to take shelter from the storm, hiding themselves in the recital of the usual formulas pertaining to a future life in which men in this life have no duties, when the nation is stirred upon one supreme moral issue, and its govern-

ment, asserting the right to sit in judgment upon its own cause, is on the brink of committing the nation to unholy war, for unholy it must be if peaceful settlement offered by an adversary be refused. Refusal to arbitrate makes war, even for a good cause, unholy; an offer to arbitrate lends dignity and importance to a poor one. Should all efforts fail, and your country, rejecting the appeal to judicial arbitration, plunge into war, your duty does not end. Calmly resolute in adherence to your convictions, stating them when called upon, though never violently intruding them, you await the result, which cannot fail to prove that those who stood for peaceful arbitration chose the right path, and have been wise counselors of their country. It is a melancholy fact that nations looking back have usually to confess that their wars have been blunders, which means they have been crimes.

And the women of the land, and the women students of St. Andrews —what shall they do? Not wait as usual until war has begun, and then, their sympathies aroused, organize innumerable societies for making and sending necessities and even luxuries to the front, or join Red Cross Societies and go themselves to the field, nursing the wounded that these may the sooner be able to return to the ranks to wound others or to be again wounded, or to kill or be killed. The tender chords of sympathy for the injured, which grace women and are so easily stirred, are always to be cherished, but it may be suggested that were their united voices raised in stern opposition to war before it was declared, urging the offer of arbitration or in earnest remonstrance against refusing it, one day of effort would then prove more effective than months of it after war has begun.

It is certain that if the good people of all parties and creeds, sinking for the time other political questions whenever the issue of war arises, were to demand arbitration, no government would dare refuse. They have it in their power in every emergency to save their country from war and ensure unbroken peace.

If in every constituency there were organized an arbitration league, consisting of members who agree that arbitration of international disputes must be offered, or accepted by the government if offered by the adversary, pledging themselves to vote in support of, or in opposition to, political parties according to their action upon this question, it is surprising how soon both parties would accept arbitration as a policy. I know of no work that would prove more fruitful for your country and for the world than this. It is by concentrating upon one issue that great causes are won.

Christmas as a Peacemaker.

BY CHAS. F. DOLE.

(This Christmas message written by Mr. Dole a year ago is good enough and true enough to deserve repetition this year, and indeed for many a Christmas yet to come.—Ed.)

“Yes, of course,” one might say, “Christmas must be a great peacemaker. Men’s hearts must be softer toward one another, and even toward their enemies, on account of the humane associations of the day and its high ideals.”

But let us face the facts. Is Christmas, or has it ever

been, much of an influence for peace? When have men ever learned to put away their harsh feelings — anger, resentment, jealousy — on that day? When have they been known to use the sentiment of the day to stop a war? Christians have not even hesitated to fight on Christmas, provided they saw a strategic chance to discomfit their enemies.

Here is Christendom preparing for the new celebration. Perhaps it will be the costliest ever known, for the world was never so rich. All manner of beautiful gifts will be made. Millions of homes will be illuminated. Happy children will be made happier. Kind things will be done for myriads of poor people. Love will be poured out in profusion. Let us all be glad at every expression of love. The world gets on toward paradise by the overflow of love.

Our immediate question, however, does not touch the reality of the joy or the love of which people will be made aware on Christmas. Our point is that this love will mainly take the line of least resistance. It will go to friends, neighbors and dependents. It will readily flow downward. Will it leap barriers and bridge chasms? Will it climb to the difficult heights? Show us where it will go out and find prodigal sons or daughters and restore them to their place in the father’s home. Show us where it will speak the word of honorable apology or forgiveness and recover alienated friends. Show us where it will go over the walls to the people of another and discredited sect, party, religion, color or race. Will Christians send messages of their love to the Jews in congratulation for their giving the world its most illustrious prophet? Will they love Jews the better henceforth? If not, why not? Will Unitarians love Baptists and Baptists love Unitarians because both have set their eyes on a star in Bethlehem? Will white Christians in Alabama shake hands more cordially after this Christmas with their negro brothers, and agree that men of all colors are sons of God? Will the White Czar on his throne, head of a hundred millions of churchmen, say a single word on Christmas to make it easier to bring the cruel war in the East to an end? How is it with you, reader? It will be easy on Christmas to love your friends. But the day is celebrated in the memory of one who actually told men to love their enemies, or, in plain words, not to have any enemies!

Take up another hard fact. In this very month, while the light of Christmas is gleaming upon us, the honored President of the United States, in his message to our National Congress, throws the stress of his argument with those who say that the most civilized of nations must express its civilization — how? By disarmament of fighting forces, by the Christmas spirit of persuasion, kindness, justice, steady goodwill, forgiveness of injuries, readiness to apologize and make redress for whatever wrong we commit as a nation? No. Our President tells that we must show our leadership by the bigness and efficiency of “great fighting ships and torpedo boats.” One hundred millions of dollars a year is not nearly enough in a time of peace to expend upon a single branch of the fighting force of the most Christian nation! Meanwhile our chief magistrate suggests, in no uncertain terms, that he wants us to be ready to play the part of the big policeman, and especially in case the people of South America do not behave themselves!